BRAMSON, PLUTZIK, MAHLER & BIRKHAEUSER
A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
2125 OAK GROVE ROAD, SUITE 120
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94598
E-MAIL: INFO@BRAMSONPLUTZIK.COM

ROBERT M. BRAMSON
ALAN R. PLUTZIK
DANIEL E. BIRKHAEUSER
JENNIFER S. ROSENBERG
MICHAEL S. STRIMLING

PAUL F. MAHLER
OF COUNSEL

FACSIMILE
(925) 945-8792

TELEPHONE
(925) 945-0200

January 26, 2010

Via ECF

Hon. Jose L. Linares, U.S.D.J.
U.S. District Court, District of New Jersey
M. L. King, Jr. Federal Building
50 Walnut Street
Newark, NJ 07101

Re: *Judy Larson, et al. v. AT&T Mobility LLC, et al.*, Civil Action No. 07-5325(JLL)

Dear Judge Linares:

This letter is submitted on behalf of Katherine Zill and the following counsel: myself and Bramson, Plutzik, Mahler & Birkhaeuser, LLP; J. David Franklin and Franklin & Franklin; and Scott A. Bursor and L. Timothy Fisher and the Law Office of Scott A. Bursor, now known as Bursor & Fisher, P.A. (collectively, "Respondents"). I write to inform the Court of recent developments affecting the Order to Show Cause issued on December 23, 2010 (the "OSC").

Today, Respondents filed with the California Court of Appeal for the First Appellate District, a "Motion for Order Staying Appeal" (the "Stay Motion") in the case of *Zill v. Sprint Spectrum, L.P.*, which is Case No. A128026 in that Court (the "*Zill* Appeal"). The Stay Motion asks the Court of Appeal to stay the *Zill* Appeal until the Third Circuit rules on the pending appeals from this Court's Final Approval Order and Judgment in the above-captioned case.

A copy of the Stay Motion in the *Zill* Appeal is attached as Exhibit A to the accompanying "Request for Judicial Notice in Opposition to Order to Show Cause," which is filed herewith. Sprint has represented to Respondents that it does not oppose the grant of the Stay Motion, and Respondents have so informed the California Court of Appeal.

Respondents respectfully request the Court to consider this letter and the accompanying Request for Judicial Notice as part of the record in connection with the briefing and argument regarding the OSC. Respondents submit that since the prosecution of the *Zill* Appeal was the premise for the OSC, the filing of the Stay Motion renders the OSC moot. Accordingly, the OSC should be vacated and the Court should neither issue an injunction against Respondents nor hold them in contempt.

Very truly yours,

Alan R. Plutzik

63474